

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No. 10/705,955
Attorney Docket No.: Q78397

Prior Art Rejections and Statement of Substance of the Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for a courteous in person interview on November 23, 2005. During the Interview, the rejection of claim 1 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,119,247 to Obayashi et al. (hereinafter “Obayashi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,014,336 to Grassl et al. (hereinafter “Grassl”) was discussed.

That is, among a number of unique features, claim 1 recites: “an electrical power converter which performs as a rectifier when said rotary machine is operated as a generator, and performs as an inverter when said rotary machine is operated as a motor; and a control device controlling said electrical power converter, thereby, when said rotary machine is operated as a motor, said control device controls said electrical power converter so as to restrict the armature current at the time of low speed rotation.”

Obayashi’s inverter (alleged converter), however, is only used to drive the U, V, W windings (col. 3, lines 23 to 44). That is, in Obayashi, there is no teaching or suggestion that the inverter is used as a rectifier when the motor is used as a generator. Moreover, in Grassl, the two control units 16 and 22 deliver a constant maximum current as required for full acceleration and braking (Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 8 to 33). In other words, Grassl does not teach or suggest that the control unit restricting armature current at the low speed rotation.

The Examiner agreed that the combined teachings of Obayashi and Grassl fail to teach or suggest the unique features of claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner indicated that this rejection will be withdrawn and further search will be performed.

Claims 2-9 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No. 10/705,955
Attorney Docket No.: Q78397

Claims 10 and 11, which depend on claim 1, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obayashi in view of Grassl and further in view of JP 11-136913 to Asao et al. (hereinafter “Asao”). Osao fails to cure the deficient teachings of Obayashi and Grassl. Therefore, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1, claims 10 and 11 are patentable over the combined teaching of Obayashi, Grassl, and Osao.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant respectfully submits that if a new Office Action becomes necessary, this Office Action should be Non-Final as the claims were not substantively amended in the previous response.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 28, 2005

Attorney Docket No.: Q78397